DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 083 273 TM 003 234

AUTHOR	Nesset, Bonna C.; Faunce, R. W.
TITLE	Bethune Continuous Progress Primary Evaluation, 1970-1972.
INSTITUTION	Minneapolis Public Schools, Minn. Dept. of Research and Evaluation.
REPORT NO	C-71-59
PUB DATE	Oct 72
NOTE	39p.; DIR-1
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Continuous Progress Plan; Kindergarten; *Primary Grades; *Program Evaluation; *Questionnaires; Small Group Instruction; *Teacher Attitudes; Technical Reports
IDENTIFIERS	*Continuous Progress Primary; Minneapolis

ABSTRACT

The Continuous Progress Primary (CPP) was adopted in grades K-3 at Bethune Elementary School (Minneapolis) in 1970. The intermediate grades (4-6) were organized in grade levels. In the CPP, each child progresses at his own rate, the emphasis being on small-group learning. The school staff took part in a questionnaire evaluation of the CPP in May 1972. Respondents indicated a need for more parental involvement, although there was more parental involvement in the CPP than in the traditional program. The staff also felt that the CPP increased their effectiveness in meeting individual student's needs; they were pleased with the basic skills instruction in the CPP, but about half of the staff felt the children in CPP got insufficient instruction in other academic areas; and they generally felt the available resources and services were adequate. The program for five-year-olds was viewed as a success, but about 80% of the staff felt that the five-year-olds should not be with the older children the entire day. Eighty percent of all respondents and all of the primary teachers thought the CPP should be continued. (An appendix provides a copy of the questionnaire and a tabulation of responses to each question.) (Author/DB)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Minneapolis Public Schools

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED 083273

TM 003 334

Bethune Continuous Progress Primary Evaluation 1970-1972

Bonna C. Nesset, Administrative Assistant

and

R. W. Faunce, Research Director

Ideas expressed in this report do not necessarily reflect the official position of the Minneapolis Public School Administration nor the Minneapolis School Board.

Order No. C-71-59
October 1972

Research and Evaluation Department
Educational Services Division
807 N. E. Broadway
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55413
(612) 348-6140

Minneapolis Public Schools

Bethune Continuous Progress Primary Evaluation
1970-1972

Summary

The Continuous Progress Primary (CPP) was adopted in grades K-3 at Bethune Elementary School in 1970. The intermediate grades (4-6) were organized in grade levels. In the CPP each child progresses at his own rate without regard to artificial "grade" or "level" barriers. The emphasis is on small group learning. See pp. 2-3

The school staff took part in a questionnaire evaluation of the Bethune CPP in May 1972. Respondents indicated a need for more parental involvement, but they did agree there was more parental involvement in the CPP than there had been in the traditional program. See pp. 4-6

The staff as a whole felt that the CPP allowed them to be more effective than they had previously been in meeting individual student needs. The CPP was viewed as an asset in meeting students' individual needs because this program broadens the range of learning opportunities open to each participant. However, some improvements may be needed to meet the needs of the superior ability child. See pp. 7-9

The staff as a whole was pleased with the basic skills instruction in the CPP. Less than one-fourth of the respondents felt that improvement was needed in the reading or the math program. The primary teachers were even more positive than the staff as a whole. However, only about half of all respondents thought the children in the CPP got sufficient instruction in other academic areas, and here the primary teachers were more critical of the program than the rest of the staff, citing a need for more personnel to teach special subject areas. See p. 11

Generally, the available resources and services (library, custodial, special education, health) were thought to be adequate. The most frequent suggestions for needed changes in staffing involved getting more staff -- especially specialists. Facilities were generally considered adequate for meeting the teaching needs of the staff -- with the exception of a need for more storage space and quiet areas for individual instruction. See pp. 6-7

The program for the five year olds was viewed as a success but about 80 percent didn't think the five year olds should be with the older children the entire day. See p. 12

Eighty percent of all respondents and 100 percent of the primary teachers said the CPP should be continued. See p. 10

Conclusions and recommendations are presented. See pp. 12-13

* * *

Research and Evaluation Department
Educational Services Division

October 1972

Table of Contents

	Page
Bethune School and Its Neighborhood.	1
The Program	2
The Continuous Progress Primary Staff.	3
The Evaluation Approach.	4
The Sample	4
Parents.	5
Materials, Supplies, Space	6
Resources and Services	6
Special Education.	7
Organization	9
Staffing and Staff Development	10
Curriculum	11
Five Year Olds	12
Conclusions and Recommendations.	12
Appendix	
The Questionnaire.	15
Responses to Bethune Continuous Progress Primary Questionnaire	26

Acknowledgments

We extend our appreciation to the Principal at Bethune, George McDonough, and to the staff at Bethune for their assistance throughout this evaluation.

Glenda Epstein wrote the description of Bethune Elementary School and the section on the development of the Continuous Progress Primary there.

Minneapolis Public Schools

Bethune Continuous Progress Primary Evaluation
1970-1972

Bethune School and Its Neighborhood

Bethune School is one of the eight elementary schools in the North Pyramid. The North Pyramid is an administratively decentralized division of the Minneapolis Public Schools. It is composed of one high school, 3 junior highs and 8 elementary schools. The purpose of the Pyramid is to open the lines of communication between the schools and the community and to bring decision making closer to the community and the students served.

Bethune is also located in one of the two "target" areas in the city. The Target Area is a portion of the core city of Minneapolis in which schools are eligible to receive benefits from programs funded under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). A school is eligible to receive Title I aid if the percentage of families residing in that school's district who receive AFDC payments (in excess of $2,000) exceeds the citywide percentage for families in that category.

Data from the 1970 census and the Welfare Department show that unemployment, divorce, delinquency, and neglect cases in this district are well above the city average; median school years completed is well below the city average.

Bethune School, built in 1969, serves children of kindergarten age through 6th grade. The primary grades K-3 are organized into four ungraded units of approximately 100 children each. This organization is called the Continuous Progress Primary (CPP), and its major goal is to provide individualized instruction so that each child may make continuous progress. The intermediate grades (4-6) are organized in traditional grades. A special education component serves 75 mentally handicapped children. The younger of these children are in the regular primary units while older mentally handicapped children are in self-contained classrooms.

Figures for 1971-1972 indicate a high proportion of Black and Indian children present (72%), a high student turnover rate (38%), and a high proportion of children in AFDC families (73%). Many of the children suffer

from medical and dental problems. There has been a high incidence of teacher turnover. Of the 24 regular teachers employed at Bethune in 1971-72, ten were in their first, second, or third year of teaching. However, the percentage of teacher turnover is decreasing. The community is not a cohesive one, and there is little parent participation in school programs, although there is an organized parent group at present.

Many individual and group efforts are being made to try to improve the home and school situation of the Bethune School children. These efforts include school sponsored programs such as hot breakfast and lunch programs, teacher aides, a youth-tutoring-youth program, reserve teacher training, and a special reading program. Private groups operating in the school include Project Motivation (individual tutoring by university students through the sponsorship of the YMCA), the Big Brother and Big Sister programs, and Women in Service to Education (WISE - individual tutoring by women volunteers).

The Program

In November 1969, a task force committee appointed by James Kennedy, then Minneapolis Public Schools' acting associate superintendent of schools for elementary education, was set up to design a model for a continuous progress nongraded primary and to make recommendations for the implementation of such a model. The task force was composed of principals, teachers, concusltants and a social worker, with additional input coming from the director of personnel and from the special assistant to the superintendent for urban affairs.

The task force outlined a model based on the Domian-Sargent report for reorganization of the elementary school and recommended that it be implemented in 1970 in an inner-city school. The program started at Bethune in the fall of 1970.

In the Continuous Progress Primary, each child progresses at his own rate without regard to artificial "grade" or "level" barriers. The CPP emphasizes individualization and small group learning experiences. In order to accomplish successful learning, staff members plan cooperatively for the most effective use of human and material resources to meet the

needs of each child. The "each child" concept is cited as the key to the success of the Continuous Progress Primary. Through the simultaneous scheduling of large and small groups, staff members can provide highly individualized attention for each child in that scheduling a large group for one teacher at a particular time frees other teachers for work with small groups needing special attention. It is also possible to provide self-selected or "by invitation" interest groups to capitalize on existing student interests or to stimulate new ones.

In planning for the model suggested in the task force committee's report, considerations of space, equipment and staffing began with each child.

The Continuous Progress Primary is expected to result in an improved educational program for the young child in the Minneapolis Public Schools because it broadens the range of learning opportunities open to each participant. It is specifically designed to include children whose unique characteristics usually limt their optimum participation in traditional educational experiences.

The Continuous Progress Primary Staff

The CPP staff included unit chairmen, teachers, student teachers, aides and volunteers. Multi-age groupings provided many opportunities for pupils to help each other as well.

A supportive team composed of a coordinator, reading resource teacher, and instructional materials assistant worked with the teaching staff to strengthen curriculum and to implement pertinent staff development plans. The principal, school social worker, psychologist and other supportive staff in the building were also vitally involved in the Continuous Progress Primary.

The model specifies that emphasis be placed on:

1. viewing each child as a unique combination of capabilities, interests, special skills and needs,
2. utilizing existing strengths of each child to plan subsequent learning experiences for the child, and
3. <u>preventing</u> failure as opposed to remediation.

There are no ceilings imposed on learning; there are no unrealistic goals set. The crucial first years of school are planned to maximize opportunities for ego-building and developing basic patterns of thinking and problem solving in a variety of academic and social situations.

The Evaluation Approach

The school staff took part in a questionnaire evaluation of the Bethune Continuous Progress Primary in May 1972, two years after the program's inception. This was to be the first phase in an evaluation which is to eventually include not just school staff, but the pupils and their parents. A committee of staff members submitted a list of evaluation questions and goals for Bethune's CPP to the Research and Evaluation Department which developed a questionnaire based on these questions.

The sample consisted of the certificated staff and the primary teacher aides. Questionnaires were administered to the CPP teacher aides on May 24, 1972 and to the rest of the staff on May 30. Absentees were given a make-up questionnaire, and responses were obtained from 87 percent of the staff. A copy of the questionnaire and responses to each question are shown in the Appendix, page 14.

The Sample

There were 51 respondents grouped as follows:

	Number	%
Primary (CPP) teachers	16	31
Intermediate teachers	8	16
Teacher Total	24	47
Resource personnel[1]	13	25
Aides	14	27
Grand Total	51	99%[2]

[1]"Resource personnel" included administrators, special resource teacher, speech, physical education, shop and home economics teachers, librarian, social workers, and a psychologist.

[2]These percentages do not total 100 percent because of rounding procedures.

About half of the sample said they had four or more years of teaching experience, and another one-fourth had one to three years experience. Intermediate teachers were the most experienced with 75 percent having taught four years or more, compared to 50 percent for the primary teachers. Only eight people on the staff had taught less than one year, and none of these were working as teachers. However, only three people -- two primary teachers and one intermediate teacher -- had had previous teaching experience in a CPP other than Bethune.

It should be stressed that the CPP is a primary grades program, and although the entire staff at Bethune took part in this evaluation, responses from the primary teachers -- who actually worked within the CPP -- were given the major emphasis for this report.

Parents

According to the staff at Bethune, parental involvement was one area where improvement is needed. Seventy percent of all respondents, but 81 percent of the primary teachers, said that more parental involvement was needed in planning next year's program (1972-73). Over half of all the teachers agreed that parents have actually had little involvement in the CPP. However, only 23 percent of the resource personnel -- who apparently see more of the parents -- agreed with this statement.

On the other hand, 45 percent of the staff said that parents are more involved in CPP than they were in traditional programs, and only nine people disagreed with this view. As would be expected, parents of primary pupils appeared to take more interest in the CPP than parents in general. Sixty-three percent of the primary teachers said parents were more involved than in traditional programs.

Fifty-six percent of the primary teachers felt that parents, generally, were pleased with the CPP, but 44 percent indicated that they were not sure on this point -- or gave some other answer. Comments indicated that there hadn't been a great deal of feedback from the parents and that parents' opinions, when expressed, were more or less evenly divided between those who liked the program and those who didn't.

Almost two-thirds (63%) of all respondents said the school should

continue to use the same report card used the previous year. Fourteen percent disagreed and another 23 percent gave some other answer. However, looking just at the teachers' responses, it appears that there was some dissatisfaction with the previous reporting system. Dissatisfaction with the report card was more typical of the intermediate teachers than the primary teachers. Sixty-nine percent of the primary teachers and 50 percent of the intermediate teachers wanted to continue to use the same report card.

About half (47%) of the staff as a whole felt the conference form was satisfactory and didn't need changing. The primary teachers were more satisfied with the present conference form than was generally the case, with 69 percent endorsing the present system. The intermediate teachers were more negative than any other group with 38 percent agreeing that the conference form needed changing.

Over half (57%) of the staff said the number of home visits should be increased next year, and again the primary teachers and aides were most emphatic in endorsing this statement with 63 percent and 71 percent agreeing, respectively.

Materials, Supplies, Space

Apparently, the physical surroundings were at least adequate for the teaching needs of the staff as a whole. About two-thirds or more of the respondents endorsed the following items as adequate: amount of space available (65%), physical set up of the unit (70%), instructional materials (74%), library (67%), location of materials (82%), and equipment (76%). However, over half of the primary teachers said the amount of space available and the library were not adequate for their teaching needs.

The most frequent requests were for storage space and quiet areas for individual instruction. The inflexibility of the library program was a persistent gripe. The locking of the materials storage room during the hours before school begins was also mentioned as an inconvenience.

Resources and Services

Generally, resources and services were thought to be adequate. (The staff was asked to rate each item as "adequate", "inadequate", or "other.")

Reading resources services, clerical services, and the Bethune school administration were each endorsed as "adequate" by over four-fifths of the respondents. Over three-fourths said instructional materials assistance was adequate. Psychological and social work services were seen as adequate by about 70 percent.

Library services were endorsed as adequate by 69 percent of the total respondents, but 56 percent of the primary teachers found library services inadequate. Their comments indicated that the amount of library time allowed was insufficient and that generally there was very little flexibility in the service offered.

While over half of the staff as a whole found the health services adequate, 38 percent of the primary teachers said this resource was inadequate. Comments indicated a need for a fully qualified RN on duty at all times and also a need for a consultant for health education in the classroom.

One-third of all respondents (but 56 percent of the primary teachers) thought the custodial services were not adequate, especially with regard to keeping the floors clean.

Only about one-fourth viewed the PTA as adequate. The comments indicated that some of the teachers didn't even know there was a PTA.

Finally, less than half of the respondents found Special Learning and Behavior Problems (SLBP) and Mentally Retarded Resource (MRR) services adequate. Comments indicated that the personnel were excellent but overextended because of the great number of students in need of their services.

Special Education

In spite of a very positive evaluation of the special education staff, only 45 percent of all respondents and only 38 percent of the teachers felt that staff services to special education students were adequate. About 40 percent (50 percent of the primary teachers) thought the special education staff could be used more effectively. Comments indicated some difference of opinion over whether the special education teacher should be used primarily as a resource person to train other teachers or as a teacher working directly with pupils.

Over half of all respondents said the special education staff has been much more useful within the CPP than under other organizational set-ups. Three-fourths of the primary teachers agreed that the special education staff was more useful within the CPP and none of them disagreed; but only one intermediate teacher agreed with this statement and three of them disagreed.

Over 60 percent of the staff felt that parental reaction to the special education approach at Bethune had been favorable. Almost two-thirds of all the respondents and all of the primary teachers agreed that the reactions of other children to the special education children had been positive.

Over one-third of all the respondents and 56 percent of the primary teachers felt that the special education pupils didn't spend enough time with the special education teachers, and one-fourth of the staff said they didn't really feel comfortable working with certain kinds of special education students. These results support the previously mentioned comments indicating a need both for more instruction for pupils with special learning difficulties by the special education staff and more training of the regular classroom teachers in these areas so that special and regular students can be integrated into ongoing programs.

The staff as a whole felt that the CPP program allowed them to be more effective than they had previously been in meeting individual student needs. Specifically, three-fourths of the respondents agreed that they were able to make more appropriate use of the supportive staff to meet individual needs, and only two people disagreed. Ninety-four percent of the primary teachers agreed with this statement, and none of them disagreed. Two-thirds of the staff felt they had more opportunity to teach children individually or in small groups. Ninety-four percent of the primary teachers (all but one) said their unit had interest groups, and over half (56%) of these teachers said that the children selected their own topics in interest groups.

About two-thirds of the staff (88 percent of the primary teachers) agreed that a smaller student-teacher ratio was needed than was found in the self-contained classroom.

Only four people -- none of them primary teachers -- thought the CPP program was inappropriate for younger children. However, there may be some improvements needed in terms of meeting the needs of the superior

ability child. About 40 percent of the staff (but 50 percent of the primary teachers) thought these children were not being adequately challenged. Most frequently, comments centered on two things: a need for more materials and more individualized instruction for these bright students, and a need for more teacher aides to help reduce the teacher-pupil ratio. Several people also mentioned the need for art and music personnel.

Organization

Fifty-five percent of the respondents (81% of the primary teachers) agreed that most children at Bethune were getting a better education than previously. Only five people -- none of them primary teachers -- disagreed with this view. About half of the total staff thought that the children at Bethune were probably better served by a CPP than by any other organizational structure, but 22 percent disagreed with this statement. About half also thought the CPP program should be extended to include the fourth, fifth, and sixth grades. Three-fourth of the primary teachers endorsed this idea, and three-fourths of the intermediate teachers disagreed.

Preparation time procedure was satisfactory for most of the staff. Almost 80 percent wanted it to be continued as it was. Less than one-fourth of the total respondents and only one of the primary teachers agreed with a statement that the teachers didn't spend enough time in direct teaching with pupils each day. Almost 80 percent felt that team teaching really did take place, but 61 percent said that some members of a team had to bear a heavier load than others. About 40 percent agreed that the aides were heavily involved in planning educational programs, and about 40 percent said they weren't. The comments on this point indicated that there may be an attendance problem with the teacher aides.

Only six people thought that discipline was more easily handled in a CPP than in a self-contained classroom, and when asked to name the weaknesses of the CPP so far, lack of personnel and lack of discipline were the most frequently cited drawbacks. Similarly, comments from the resource personnel suggested there could be more planning and cooperation among the teachers so that the students could be kept track of at all times.

In fact, about half of the staff (62 percent of the primary teachers) said attendance taking procedures were inadequate and that it was hard to keep track of the students thoughout the day. In addition, almost 40 percent of the teachers said that a systematic, school-wide record on each child was lacking.

Some respondents suggested that there are some children who would do better in a more structured, self-contained classroom and that the ideal situation would be to offer a variety of teaching situations instead of just one type. However, the most frequently mentioned asset of the CPP was its ability to meet more effectively the individual needs of each child by exposing them to a more varied environment and more individual choices. All things considered, 80 percent of the total respondents said the CPP should be continued at Bethune, and only three people disagreed with this -- none of them teachers actually working in the CPP.

Staffing and Staff Development

Apparently there were some inadequacies felt with regard to the staffing of the Bethune CPP last year. One-fourth of the total respondents and almost two-thirds of the primary teachers thought the size of the staff was inadequate, and about one-fourth of all the respondents thought there was room for improvement in the proper utilization of aides. Only one-third of the total respondents and 44 percent of the primary teachers thought planning time was adequate.

On the other hand, over half of all respondents and 81 percent of the primary teachers thought the amount of time for unit meetings was adequate, and over two-thirds of the staff found Tuesday afternnons to be a convenient time to hold these meetings. Another two-thirds (88% of the primary teachers) thought unit chairmen meetings were adequate.

About 60 percent of the total staff felt their skills and training were being used effectively, and over half (81 percent of the primary teachers) said the staff training for CPP was adequate.

The most frequent suggestions for needed changes in staffing involved getting more staff -- especially specialists. However, staff increases should not result in larger units. Several people said the units needed to be smaller -- both in terms of numbers of children and teachers.

Suggestions for staff training most frequently involved intra-staff communication, teamwork and cooperation.

Curriculum

The staff as a whole was pleased with the basic skills instruction in the CPP. Less than one-fourth of the respondents felt that improvement was needed in the reading or the math program. The primary teachers were even more positive than the staff as a whole. None of the primary teachers thought improvement was needed in reading, and only one-fourth thought the math program could be bettered.

However, only about half of all respondents thought that the children in the CPP got sufficient instruction in other academic areas, and here the primary teachers were more critical of the program than the rest of the staff. In fact, almost 40 percent of the primary teachers said they didn't think the children in their units got sufficient instruction in these areas. They saw a need for great improvement in the following fields: library services (81%), home economics (81%), music (75%), shop (75%), science (63%), art (50%), and social studies (44%). Comparable percentages for the respondents as a whole were much lower, ranging from 27-53 percent. These are the areas where the Bethune staff would like to have some special personnel added.

About two-thirds of all the respondents thought the time allotted for gym was sufficient and saw no real improvements needed in the physical education program. Comments, however, indicated that some special programs for children with perceptual-motor problems should be added.

Almost two-thirds of the total thought it was necessary to provide food for all the children, but half of the primary teachers disagreed, especially with reference to breakfast.

Most of the staff felt that academic progress should be a consideration in promotion to the fourth grade, but more of the intermediate teachers than primary teachers held this opinion. Thirty-eight percent of the primary teachers and only 13 percent of the intermediate teachers agreed that academic progress should be a <u>minor</u> consideration in fourth grade promotion.

Five Year Olds

Only those 33 staff members who had worked with five year olds answered questions pertaining to these issues. Four out of five of these people indicated they had worked with five year olds during the past year. Twenty-seven percent (43 percent of the primary teachers), however, said they did not feel adequately trained to work with five-year olds.

Generally, the program for the five year olds was viewed as a success. Nine out of ten respondents agreed that the contact with adults in school was a major benefit to five year olds. Three-fourths of these respondents (93 percent of the primary teachers) agreed that a full day program for five year olds had resulted in definite academic and social gains.

However, about 80 percent of these 33 people didn't think the five year olds should be with the older children the entire day. About 60 percent of the respondents said that older children have a positive influence being with five year olds and only four people thought the older children resented being with five year olds. Sixty-four percent said they thought five year olds should spend a full day at school, but many made comments that a full day was just too much for some of these children and that those who are less mature should not be required to stay for the entire day. Many suggested that a time and place for naps would be a big help for this age group.

Conclusions and Recommendations

All but two primary teachers and all of the aides who actually worked within the CPP planned to return next year, and overall, the staff at Bethune viewed the CPP as an outstandingly successful program so far. However, they pointed out weaknesses and made many specific recommendations for ways to improve the program in the future.

According to the staff, parental involvement in the CPP is in need of improvement. Most of the respondents were fairly satisfied with the previous report card and conference form, but many agreed that the number of home visits should be increased, barring time constraints.

Apparently, storage space is at a premium and some assistance in this area, such as shelves or cabinets, would be well received, as would

quiet areas for individual instruction. The "locked door problem" in Room 101 (materials storage) could also use some attention so that teachers could obtain materials before school starts in the morning.

Indications are that the library program is definitely in need of revision -- that it's too inflexible to be accessible to or usable by the children, and the amount of library time made available was insufficient.

Comments indicated a need for improvement in custodial services -- especially with regard to dirty floors.

There was a definite desire voiced for more special education personnel. The present special education staff was overwhelmingly endorsed for the excellent quality of service provided in the face of such a big work load. The need here is double-edged -- both for staff to serve as resource teachers to train the classroom teachers and to work directly with children. Another weakness was the lack of special art and music personnel.

Apparently, there is some tendency to use the higher ability children as teachers' helpers rather than finding other activities to challenge them. Frequently suggested solutions for this problem were to increase the number of teacher aides and to more effectively use the present aides.

Although the staff overwhelmingly supported the program for five-year olds, there was general agreement that these children should not be with the older children the entire day. There were some respondents who thought that at least some five year olds should only attend school half days, but most agreed the all day program was beneficial. It was frequently suggested that provisions for nap time would help.

* * *

Appendix

Minneapolis Public Schools

Bethune Continuous Progress Primary Evaluation
May 1972

To: Bethune Staff:

This questionnaire was developed at the request of the Bethune Continuous Progress Primary (CPP) Committee to aid in your evaluation of your program.

The questionnaire weighs a lot, but completing it really isn't so bad or time consuming. Most responses require simple check marks. Answering time ranges from 15 minutes up, depending on how much fervor you have for--or against--CPP.

Preliminary results will be in your school on May 31. A more detailed report will be sent later, either in June or September.

We have tried to keep the questionnaire simple by asking for agree-disagree answers. This simplified approach allows a lot of questions to be asked without making your job too burdensome. But it also causes problems if the question can't honestly be answered with these simple responses. In those cases, please mark "Other answer" and comment on your opinion at the bottom of the page.

Signatures are not needed. We are evaluating the program; not individuals.

Research and Evaluation Department

RWF:dm
5/19/72

Parents

Indicate whether you agree or disagree with each of the following statements.

		Agree	Disagree	Not sure, or some other answer
1.	Parents, generally, are pleased with the CPP	____	____	____
2.	We should continue to use the report card we used this year	____	____	____
3.	Parents have actually had little involvement in the CPP	____	____	____
4.	Our conference form needs changing	____	____	____
5.	The number of home visits should be increased next year	____	____	____
6.	We need more parental involvement in planning next year's program	____	____	____
7.	Parents are more involved in CPP than they were in traditional programs	____	____	____

Comments: (Please refer to item number)_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Materials, Supplies, Space

Indicate whether or not each of the listed items was adequate for your teaching needs.

		Adequate	Not Adequate	Other Answers
1.	Amount of space available	____	____	____
2.	Physical set-up of the unit	____	____	____
3.	Instructional materials	____	____	____
4.	Library	____	____	____
5.	Location of materials (e.g. in #101)	____	____	____
6.	Equipment	____	____	____

7. What materials, supplies, space are needed to improve your teaching effectiveness? _____

Comments: (Please refer to item number)_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Resources and Services

How adequate have resources and services been at Bethune?

	Adequate	Not Adequate	Other Answer
1. Custodial services	____	____	____
2. Reading resource services	____	____	____
3. Instructional materials assistance	____	____	____
4. SLBP	____	____	____
5. MRR	____	____	____
6. Clerical services	____	____	____
7. School administration	____	____	____
8. Library services	____	____	____
9. Psychological services	____	____	____
10. Social work services	____	____	____
11. Health services	____	____	____
12. PTA	____	____	____

What services are you most in need of, which are not now being adequately delivered? _____

_____

Comments: (Please refer to item number) _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Special Education

Indicate whether you agree or disagree with each of the following statements.

	Agree	Disagree	Other Answer
1. Staff services to special education students were adequate	____	____	____
2. I don't really feel comfortable working with certain kinds of Special Education students	____	____	____
3. The reactions of other children to the Special Education children has been positive	____	____	____
4. The Special Education staff can be used more effectively	____	____	____
5. Parental reaction to our Special Education approach has been favorable	____	____	____
6. The Special Education staff has been much more useful within the CPP than under other organization set-up	____	____	____
7. Special Education pupils do not spend enough time with Special Education teachers	____	____	____

8. What changes should be made in your staffing for and treatment of Special Education students next year, if any? _____

_____

Comments: (Please refer to item number) _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Individualization

Indicate whether the following items were True or False for the Bethune CPP this year.

		True	False	Other Answer
1.	Children with superior ability were adequately challenged	____	____	____
2.	Individual student needs were better met than in previous years	____	____	____
3.	The program was not appropriate for younger children	____	____	____
4.	My unit had interest groups	____	____	____
5.	A smaller student-teacher ratio was needed than in the self-contained classroom	____	____	____
6.	I had more opportunity to teach children individually or in small groups	____	____	____
7.	Children selected their own topics in interest groups	____	____	____
8.	We were able to make more appropriate use of the supportive staff to meet individual needs	____	____	____
9.	What needs to be done next year to improve individualized instruction?			

_____

_____

Comments: (Please refer to item numbers) _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Organization

Indicate whether you agree or disagree with each of the following statements.

		Agree	Disagree	Other Answer
1.	CPP is no darn good.	____	____	____
2.	Children at Bethune are probably better served by a CPP than by any other organizational structure	____	____	____
3.	Discipline is more easily handled in a CPP than in a self-contained classroom	____	____	____
4.	The CP Program should include 4th grade	____	____	____
5.	The CP Program should be extended through 5th grade	____	____	____
6.	The CP Program should be extended through 6th grade	____	____	____
7.	CPP should be continued at Bethune	____	____	____
8.	A systematic, school-wide record on each child is lacking	____	____	____
9.	Our preparation time procedure should be continued as is	____	____	____
10.	Team teaching doesn't really take place	____	____	____
11.	Teachers don't really spend enough time in direct teaching with pupils each day	____	____	____
12.	Aides are heavily involved in planning educational programs	____	____	____
13.	Most children at Bethune are getting a better education than previously	____	____	____
14.	Some members of a team must bear a heavier load than others	____	____	____

15. What are the major values of CPP--if any?_____

_____

16. What are its major weaknesses?_____

_____

Comments: (Please refer to item number)_____

_____

Use back of this page for further comments

Staffing and Staff Development

How adequate was the staffing of the Bethune CPP this year?

		Adequate	Not Adequate	Other Answer
1.	Amount of time for unit meeting	____	____	____
2.	Size of your unit staff	____	____	____
3.	Time of unit meetings (Tuesday afternoons)	____	____	____
4.	Unit chairmen meetings	____	____	____
5.	Proper utilization of aides	____	____	____
6.	Utilization of your skills and training	____	____	____
7.	Planning time	____	____	____
8.	Staff training for CPP	____	____	____

9. What changes in staffing, if any, are needed?_____

_____

_____

_____

10. What staff training, if any, is needed?_____

_____

_____

_____

Comments: (Please refer to item numbers)_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Curriculum

Indicate whether you agree or disagree with each of the following statements.

		Agree	Disagree	Other Answer
1.	It is necessary to feed all the children	____	____	____
2.	Attendance taking procedures are inadequate	____	____	____
3.	Children in my unit get sufficient instruction in academic areas	____	____	____
4.	The time alloted for gym is sufficient	____	____	____
	Great improvement is needed in:			
5.	the physical education program	____	____	____
6.	library services	____	____	____
7.	home economics	____	____	____
8.	shop	____	____	____
9.	math	____	____	____
10.	reading	____	____	____
11.	social studies	____	____	____
12.	art	____	____	____
13.	music	____	____	____
14.	science	____	____	____
15.	Academic progress should be a minor consideration in 4th grade promotion	____	____	____

16. What major improvements in curriculum are needed? _____

_____

Comments: (Please refer to item number) _____

_____

_____

Five year olds

Only staff members who have worked with five year olds should answer these items. Indicate whether you agree or disagree with each of the following statements.

	Agree	Disagree	Other Answer
1. Other children resent being with 5 year olds	____	____	____
2. Most 5 year olds should spend a full day at school	____	____	____
3. Older children have a positive influence on 5 year olds	____	____	____
4. Five year olds should not be with the older children the entire day	____	____	____
5. The contact with adults in school is a major benefit to five year olds	____	____	____
6. A full day program for five year olds has resulted in definite academic and social gains	____	____	____
7. I do not feel adequately trained to work with five year olds	____	____	____
8. I worked with five year olds this year	____	____	____

9. What changes, if any, should be made in the program for five year olds next year? _____

_____

_____

Comments: (Please refer to item number) _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

My position is:

	Check One	Unit (circle one)
primary teacher	_____	N E W S
intermediate teacher	_____	
aide	_____	N E W S
administrator	_____	
other	_____	

I had previous experience in a self-contained classroom _____Yes No_____

Do you plan to return to Bethune next year? _____Yes No_____ Don't know_____

Comment: _____

_____

_____

_____

How many years of teaching experience do you have? (check one)

Have not taught _____

Less than one year _____

1 - 3 years _____

4 or more years _____

I had the following kinds of teaching experience:

Kindergarten _____

Primary _____

Intermediate _____

Special Education _____

Secondary _____

CPP-other than Bethune _____

May 1972 Research and Evaluation Department

Responses to Bethune Continuous Progress Primary Questionnaire
May 1972

Question	Response	Primary Teachers N=16	Inter-mediate Teachers N=8	Resource Personnel N=13	All Certified Personnel N=37	Aides N=14	Grand Total N=51
Parents							
1. Parents, generally, are pleased with the CPP	Agree	56%	13%	31%	38%	64%	45%
	Disagree	0	13	0	3	0	2
	Other	44	75	69	59	36	53
2. We should continue to use the report card we used this year	Agree	69	50	46	57	79	63
	Disagree	19	38	0	16	7	14
	Other	12	13	54	27	14	23
3. Parents have actually had little involvement in the CPP	Agree	56	50	23	43	43	43
	Disagree	31	13	15	22	43	28
	Other	13	38	62	35	14	29
4. Our conference form needs changing	Agree	19	38	0	16	7	14
	Disagree	69	38	23	46	50	47
	Other	12	25	77	38	43	39
5. The number of home visits should be increased next year	Agree	63	38	46	51	71	57
	Disagree	25	13	8	16	7	14
	Other	12	50	46	32	21	29
6. We need more parental involvement in planning next year's program	Agree	81	63	46	65	86	70
	Disagree	0	13	0	3	14	6
	Other	19	25	54	32	0	24
7. Parents are more involved in CPP than they were in traditional programs	Agree	63	25	31	43	50	45
	Disagree	6	38	15	16	21	18
	Other	31	38	54	41	29	37
Materials, Supplies, Space							
1. Amount of space available	Adequate	44	75	62	57	86	65
	Not Adequate	56	25	31	40	14	33
	Other	0	0	8	3	0	2

Responses (continued)

Question	Response	Primary Teachers	Inter-mediate Teachers	Resource Personnel	All Certified Personnel	Aides	Grand Total
Materials, Supplies, Space (continued)							
2. Physical set-up of the unit	Adequate	62	88	69	70	71	70
	Not Adequate	38	13	15	24	7	20
	Other	0	0	15	5	21	10
3. Instructional materials	Adequate	75	75	62	70	86	74
	Not Adequate	25	13	8	16	0	12
	Other	0	13	31	14	14	14
4. Library	Adequate	38	75	77	60	86	67
	Not Adequate	50	25	15	32	0	23
	Other	12	0	8	8	14	10
5. Location of materials	Adequate	75	88	77	78	93	82
	Not Adequate	12	13	8	11	0	8
	Other	12	0	15	11	7	10
6. Equipment	Adequate	81	75	77	78	71	76
	Not Adequate	19	25	15	19	7	16
	Other	0	0	8	3	21	8
Resources and Services							
1. Custodial services	Adequate	38	63	62	51	79	59
	Not Adequate	56	25	38	43	7	33
	Other	6	13	0	5	14	8
2. Reading resource services	Adequate	88	88	69	81	93	84
	Not Adequate	6	13	0	5	0	4
	Other	6	0	31	14	7	12
3. Instructional materials assistance	Adequate	81	88	69	78	71	76
	Not Adequate	13	13	15	14	7	12
	Other	6	0	15	8	21	12
4. SLBP	Adequate	50	38	46	46	43	45
	Not Adequate	50	50	31	43	14	35
	Other	0	13	23	11	43	20

Responses (continued)

Question	Response	Primary Teachers	Intermediate Teachers	Resource Personnel	All Certified Personnel	Aides	Grand Total
Resources and Services (continued)							
5. MRR	Adequate	44	50	46	46	43	45
	Not Adequate	50	38	31	41	14	33
	Other	6	13	23	13	43	22
6. Clerical Services	Adequate	88	88	77	84	79	82
	Not Adequate	6	13	15	11	0	8
	Other	6	0	8	5	21	10
7. School Administration	Adequate	94	75	69	81	86	82
	Not Adequate	6	25	23	16	7	14
	Other	0	0	8	3	7	4
8. Library services	Adequate	44	75	62	57	100	69
	Not Adequate	56	25	31	40	0	29
	Other	0	0	8	3	0	2
9. Psychological services	Adequate	75	63	69	70	64	68
	Not Adequate	25	38	8	22	0	16
	Other	0	0	23	8	36	16
10. Social work services	Adequate	75	63	62	68	79	70
	Not Adequate	25	25	31	27	0	20
	Other	0	13	8	5	21	10
11. Health services	Adequate	50	75	54	57	86	65
	Not Adequate	38	25	38	35	0	25
	Other	12	0	8	8	14	10
12. PTA	Adequate	31	0	15	19	36	24
	Not Adequate	56	63	15	43	57	47
	Other	13	38	69	38	7	29
Special Education							
1. Staff services to special education students were adequate	Agree	38	38	54	43	50	45
	Disagree	56	25	31	41	21	35
	Other	6	38	15	16	29	20

Responses (continued)

Question	Response	Primary Teachers	Intermediate Teachers	Resource Personnel	All Certified Personnel	Aides	Grand Total
Special Education (continued)							
2. I don't really feel comfortable working with certain kinds of Special Education students	Agree	25	38	31	30	14	25
	Disagree	69	38	62	59	57	59
	Other	6	25	8	11	29	16
3. The reactions of other children to the Special Education children has been positive	Agree	100	25	31	60	71	63
	Disagree	0	50	38	24	14	21
	Other	0	25	31	16	14	16
4. The Special Education staff can be used more effectively	Agree	50	25	38	41	36	39
	Disagree	44	50	31	41	50	43
	Other	6	25	31	18	14	18
5. Parental reaction to our Special Education approach has been favorable	Agree	69	50	54	60	64	61
	Disagree	0	25	0	5	0	4
	Other	31	25	46	35	14	35
6. The Special Education staff has been much more useful within the CPP than under other organization set-up	Agree	75	13	46	51	50	51
	Disagree	0	38	8	11	0	8
	Other	25	50	46	38	50	41
7. Special Education pupils do not spend enough time with Special Education teachers	Agree	56	13	8	30	57	37
	Disagree	31	63	62	49	21	41
	Other	13	25	31	22	21	22
Individualization							
1. Children with superior ability were adequately challenged	True	50	38	15	35	57	41
	False	50	13	46	41	36	39
	Other	0	50	38	24	7	20
2. Individual student needs were better met than in previous years	True	88	25	69	68	86	72
	False	6	50	8	16	7	14
	Other	6	25	23	16	7	14

Responses (continued)

Question	Response	Primary Teachers	Inter-mediate Teachers	Resource Personnel	All Certified Personnel	Aides	Grand Total
Individualization (continued)							
3. The program was not appropriate for younger children	True	0	25	8	8	7	8
	False	88	13	77	68	79	71
	Other	12	63	15	24	14	21
4. My unit had interest groups	True	94	38	54	68	79	70
	False	6	0	38	16	14	16
	Other	0	63	8	16	7	14
5. A smaller student-teacher ratio was needed than in the self-contained classroom	True	88	63	46	68	50	63
	False	12	13	31	19	50	27
	Other	0	25	23	13	0	10
6. I had more opportunity to teach children individually or in small groups	True	69	38	54	57	93	67
	False	31	0	15	19	0	14
	Other	0	63	31	24	7	19
7. Children selected their own topics in interest groups	True	56	50	46	51	57	53
	False	6	0	15	8	21	12
	Other	38	50	38	41	21	35
8. We were able to make more appropriate use of the supportive staff to meet individual needs	True	94	38	62	70	86	74
	False	0	0	15	5	0	4
	Other	6	63	23	24	14	22
Organization							
1. CPP is no darn good	Agree	0	13	8	5	14	8
	Disagree	94	63	77	81	79	80
	Other	6	25	15	14	7	12
2. Children at Bethune are probably better served by a CPP than by any other organizational structure	Agree	50	13	62	46	64	51
	Disagree	19	75	8	27	7	22
	Other	31	13	31	27	29	27
3. Discipline is more easily handled in a CPP than in a self-contained classroom	Agree	19	25	0	13	7	12
	Disagree	75	63	77	73	71	72
	Other	6	13	23	13	21	16

Responses (continued)

Question	Response	Primary Teachers	Intermediate Teachers	Resource Personnel	All Certified Personnel	Aides	Grand Total
Organization (continued)							
4. The CP Program should include 4th grade	Agree	75	25	38	51	36	47
	Disagree	12	63	31	30	36	31
	Other	12	13	31	19	29	22
5. The CP Program should be extended through 5th grade	Agree	75	13	38	49	50	49
	Disagree	6	75	31	30	36	31
	Other	19	13	31	21	14	20
6. The CP Program should be extended through 6th grade	Agree	75	13	38	49	29	43
	Disagree	6	75	31	30	57	37
	Other	19	13	31	21	14	20
7. CPP should be continued at Bethune	Agree	88	38	85	76	93	80
	Disagree	0	25	8	8	0	6
	Other	12	38	8	16	7	14
8. A systematic, school-wide record on each child is lacking	Agree	44	25	38	38	7	30
	Disagree	31	38	15	27	57	35
	Other	25	38	46	35	36	35
9. Our preparation time procedure should be continued as is	Agree	88	63	77	78	79	78
	Disagree	0	13	8	5	0	4
	Other	12	25	15	16	21	18
10. Team teaching doesn't really take place	Agree	0	13	15	8	0	6
	Disagree	81	75	62	73	93	78
	Other	19	13	23	19	7	16
11. Teachers don't really spend enough time in direct teaching with pupils each day	Agree	6	38	38	24	21	23
	Disagree	94	63	46	70	79	73
	Other	0	0	15	5	0	4
12. Aides are heavily involved in planning educational programs	Agree	37	50	15	32	57	39
	Disagree	44	25	62	46	29	41
	Other	19	25	23	22	14	20
13. Most children at Bethune are getting a better education than previously	Agree	81	25	31	51	64	55
	Disagree	0	50	8	14	64	10
	Other	19	25	62	35	36	35

Responses (continued)

Question	Response	Primary Teachers	Inter-mediate Teachers	Resource Personnel	All Certified Personnel	Aides	Grand Total
Organization (continued)							
14. Some members of a team must bear a heavier load than others	Agree	56	50	69	59	64	61
	Disagree	38	25	15	27	36	29
	Other	6	25	15	14	0	10
Staffing and Staff Development							
1. Amount of time for unit meeting	Adequate	81	50	31	57	43	53
	Not Adequate	9	13	23	19	29	22
	Other	0	38	46	24	29	25
2. Size of your unit staff	Adequate	38	63	31	40	71	49
	Not Adequate	62	0	8	30	14	25
	Other	0	38	62	30	14	25
3. Time of unit meetings (Tuesday afternoons)	Adequate	81	75	62	73	57	69
	Not Adequate	13	0	0	5	14	8
	Other	6	25	38	22	29	23
4. Unit chairmen meetings	Adequate	88	75	38	68	50	63
	Not Adequate	6	0	8	5	0	4
	Other	6	25	54	27	50	33
5. Proper utilization of aides	Adequate	69	50	38	54	64	57
	Not Adequate	31	13	38	30	14	25
	Other	0	38	23	16	21	18
6. Utilization of your skills and training	Adequate	69	38	46	54	64	57
	Not Adequate	31	13	31	27	7	22
	Other	0	50	23	19	29	22
7. Planning time	Adequate	56	38	54	51	43	49
	Not Adequate	44	25	15	30	43	33
	Other	0	38	31	19	14	18
8. Staff training for CPP	Adequate	81	50	31	57	36	51
	Not Adequate	19	13	23	19	43	25
	Other	0	38	46	24	21	24

Responses (continued)

Question	Response	Primary Teachers	Intermediate Teachers	Resource Personnel	All Certified Personnel	Aides	Grand Total
Curriculum							
1. It is necessary to feed all the children	Agree	44	63	77	59	79	65
	Disagree	50	38	23	38	14	31
	Other	6	0	0	3	7	4
2. Attendance taking procedures are inadequate	Agree	62	13	77	57	29	49
	Disagree	38	50	23	35	64	43
	Other	0	38	0	8	7	8
3. Children in my unit get sufficient instruction in academic areas	Agree	62	25	31	43	71	51
	Disagree	38	25	8	24	21	24
	Other	0	50	62	32	7	25
4. The time alloted for gym is sufficient	Agree	69	75	46	62	79	67
	Disagree	31	13	38	30	7	23
	Other	0	13	15	8	14	10
Great improvement is needed in:							
5. the physical education program	Agree	19	0	23	16	7	14
	Disagree	69	88	38	62	57	61
	Other	12	13	38	22	36	25
6. library services	Agree	81	25	31	51	7	39
	Disagree	13	63	23	27	64	37
	Other	6	13	46	22	29	24
7. home economics	Agree	81	50	46	62	29	53
	Disagree	13	38	8	16	36	22
	Other	6	13	46	22	36	25
8. shop	Agree	75	0	23	41	21	35
	Disagree	19	88	15	32	43	35
	Other	6	13	62	27	36	30
9. math	Agree	25	38	23	27	21	25
	Disagree	69	38	23	46	43	45
	Other	6	25	54	27	36	29

Responses (continued)

Question	Response	Primary Teachers	Inter-mediate Teachers	Resource Personnel	All Certified Personnel	Aides	Grand Total
Curriculum (continued)							
Great improvement is needed in:							
10. reading	Agree	0	38	15	13	29	18
	Disagree	88	38	31	57	36	51
	Other	12	25	54	30	36	31
11. social studies	Agree	44	13	8	24	36	27
	Disagree	56	63	38	51	29	45
	Other	0	25	54	24	36	27
12. art	Agree	50	0	23	30	29	29
	Disagree	44	75	38	49	29	43
	Other	6	25	38	21	43	28
13. music	Agree	75	0	54	51	29	45
	Disagree	25	75	8	30	29	29
	Other	0	25	38	19	43	26
14. science	Agree	63	0	38	41	36	39
	Disagree	31	63	31	38	29	35
	Other	6	38	31	21	36	26
15. Academic progress should be a minor consideration in 4th grade promotion	Agree	38	13	31	30	14	26
	Disagree	56	50	54	54	43	51
	Other	6	38	15	16	43	24
Five Year Olds							
1. Other children resent being with 5 year olds	Agree	0	0	33	9	18	12
	Disagree	93	100	33	77	82	79
	Other	7	0	33	14	0	9
2. Most 5 year olds should spend a full day at school	Agree	64	0	33	50	91	64
	Disagree	29	50	50	36	9	27
	Other	7	50	17	14	0	9
3. Older children have a positive influence on 5 year olds	Agree	57	50	67	59	73	64
	Disagree	7	0	0	5	18	9
	Other	36	50	33	36	9	27

Responses (continued)

Question	Response	Primary Teachers	Inter-mediate Teachers	Resource Personnel	All Certified Personnel	Aides	Grand Total
Five Year Olds (continued)							
4. Five year olds should not be with the older children the entire day	Agree	93	100	67	86	64	79
	Disagree	7	0	17	9	36	18
	Other	0	0	17	5	0	3
5. The contact with adults in school is a major benefit to five year olds	Agree	93	100	83	90	91	91
	Disagree	7	0	0	5	9	6
	Other	0	0	17	5	0	3
6. A full day program for five year olds has resulted in definite academic and social gains	Agree	93	0	33	68	82	73
	Disagree	0	50	50	18	9	15
	Other	7	50	17	14	9	12
7. I do not feel adequately trained to work with five year olds	Agree	43	50	0	32	18	27
	Disagree	57	50	100	68	82	73
	Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
8. I worked with five year olds this year	Agree	86	0	83	77	91	82
	Disagree	7	0	17	9	9	9
	Other	7	100	0	14	0	9
I had previous experience in a self-contained classroom	Yes	69	100	53	70	85	74
	No	31	0	38	27	15	24
Do you plan to return to Bethune next year?	Yes	88	62	53	70	100	78
	No	12	25	23	19	0	14
	Don't know	0	12	23	11	0	8
How many years of teaching experience do you have?	Have not taught	0	0	23	8	21	12
	Less than one year	0	0	7	3	7	4
	1 - 3 years	50	25	23	35	0	25
	4 or more years	50	75	46	54	35	49
I had the following kinds of teaching experience:	Kindergarten	56	0	30	35	28	33
	Primary	94	37	69	73	21	59
	Intermediate	19	100	38	43	7	33
	Special Education	38	25	30	32	21	29
	Secondary	6	0	0	3	0	2
	CPP-other than Bethune	12	12	0	8	0	6